Variability of the Galactic CRs and Diffuse Gamma-Ray Emission Predicted with GALPROP

Peter D. Marinos^{1,2}, Troy A. Porter¹, Gavin P. Rowell², Guðlaugur Jóhannesson³, Igor V. Moskalenko¹ KIPAC



¹W. W. Hansen Experimental Physics Laboratory and Kavli Institute for Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA
²School of Physical Sciences, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA 5000, Australia

³Science Institute, University of Iceland, IS-107 Reykjavik, Iceland

pmarinos@stanford.edu



- Steady-state CR diffusion models have been standard for the 100 MeV to 100 GeV regime for decades.
- Observations of the diffuse emission are now being performed at higher energies. We need to connect the diffuse emission across the GeV–PeV regimes.
- Previous work characterised the modelling uncertainty in the TeV regime over a grid of steady-state models.
- For higher energies the rapid energy losses of the electrons necessitate the consideration of discrete CR injection sites.
- The TeV $\gamma-{\rm ray}$ emission is then expected to vary on timescales \sim lifetimes of the sources.
- How large are these variations? Can a component of discrete sources explain the TeV–PeV γ -ray excess observed by LHAASO and other observatories?



- CR hadrons are injected via a steady-state, smoothly varying distribution. CR leptons are injected via discrete sources with finite lifetimes.
- Source lifetimes are varied from 10–200 kyr.
- Creation rates are varied from 0.02–0.002 yr⁻¹ (average interval between sources of 50–500 yr).
- We analyse 5 Myr of simulation results for six different combinations of source parameters (L010R100, L050R100, L100R100, L200R100, L100R050, L100R500).
- Injection spectra are fit such that their post-diffusion spectra at the Solar position reproduce measurements on the final timestep.
- ISM gas from Jóhannesson et al. 2018, SA50 source distribution, R12 ISRF, PBSS GMF (see Porter et al. 2017, and references therein).

CR Electron Variability Throughout the Milky Way

- Local measurements show a potential cutoff around 1 TeV.
- Cutoff is reproduced for times with no nearby sources.
- → Altering the Galaxy-wide injection spectrum is *not* required to reproduce the cutoff.
- This variability will be imparted onto the γ rays, and can be quantified to define a modelling uncertainty.



Measuring the Variability





- Need to define a measurement of the variability.
- However, fluctuations are non-symmetric and weighted towards large increases.
- Define a 'containment factor', which is the factor difference from the steady-state values that contains some percentage of the data.
- For example, 68% of the time-dependent values are within a factor S₆₈ from the steady-state flux.

CR Electron Variability Throughout the Milky Way

- Can apply the containment factor analysis throughout the Milky Way.
- Below ~1 TeV the electron flux is steady throughout the Galaxy.
- Above 10 TeV the electron flux is steady within the spiral arms and fluctuates by factors ≥2 for the inter-arm regions.



Comparing GALPROP to H.E.S.S.



- HGPS large-scale \Rightarrow flux above 1TeV minus resolved sources.
- HGPS residual ⇒ large-scale minus unresolved sources (includes flux uncertainty).
- \cdot 5 σ sensitivities for HGPS and CTA's proposed 10-year plan.
- GALPROP agrees with the lower limits of the HGPS observations.
- CTA can be expected to make a 5σ detection with current plans.







Polar Region Flux





- Polar region flux above 1TeV is Galactic in origin.
- For most timesteps the IC emission is the dominant component for both Galactic polar regions.
- The polar flux then provides an opportunity to constrain the electron flux away from the Solar neighbourhood with future observations.

Constraining the Source Parameters



- Lxxx \Rightarrow source lifetime in kiloyears.
- Ryyy \Rightarrow average time between source creation in years.
- Showing four source parameter combinations to represent the variability across the time-dependent models.
- Current measurements of the diffuse emission are unable to further constrain these source parameters.



Comparing GALPROP to IceCube





- IceCube recently announced model-dependent observations of Galactic neutrinos.
- This neutrino emission can be used to constrain hadronic components.
- All neutrino fluxes are per-flavour.
- GALPROP predictions are in agreement with the model-dependent IceCube fluxes.
- Working on quantifying the spatial coincidence between GALPROP and IceCube.

Summary



- The leptonic CR and γ -ray fluxes above 1 TeV experience large fluctuations due to the discrete nature of the CR accelerators.
- Accurate γ-ray predictions will require precise locations of all CR accelerators in the Galaxy. As precise locations are not currently known, we have found the variability of the models.
- We found CTA should be able to observe the diffuse emission for the central 90° of the Galactic plane.
- For γ rays in the TeV–PeV regime an unresolved leptonic component is able to reproduce the LHAASO excess with no alterations to the model.
- While the CR source parameters (lifetimes and creation rates) impact the diffuse emission, we are unable to recover their values from current measurements of the diffuse emission.

See arXiv:2411.03553 for more information.

Additional Slide: PWNe as Leptonic PeVatrons

- LHAASO Collaboration, et al. 2021 found >1 PeV γ rays from the Crab Nebula. This result would require >1 PeV electrons.
- Cao, Z., et al. 2021 analysed 12 γ -ray sources with LHAASO, finding γ rays up to 1.4 PeV. The only confirmed PWNe was the Crab Nebula, and an additional nine sources have potential PWN counterparts.
- Burgess, D., et al. 2022 found 2 PeV electrons are required to explain the γ -ray emission around the Eel PWN.
- Liu, Y.-M., et al. 2024 looked at 17 PWNe, 16 of which show CR electrons >100 TeV. They state that 3 PWNe have CR electrons confidently confirmed >PeV. Additionally, leptonic injection is approximately constant for the first 15 kyr.
- +others

Abdollahi, S., et al. 2017, PhRvD, 95, 082007 Adrianni, O., et al. 2023, PhRvL, 131, 191001 Aguilar, M., et al. 2021, PhR, 894, 1 Aharonian, F., et al. 2009, A&A, 508, 561 Ambrosi, G., et al. 2017, Nature, 552, 63 Burgess, D., et al. 2022, ApJ, 930, 148 Cao, Z., et al. 2021, Nature, 594, 33 Cao, Z., et al. 2023, PhRvL, 131, 151001 Cataldo, M., et al. 2020, ApJ, 904, 85 H.E.S.S. Collaboration, et al. 2018, A&A, 612, A1 IceCube Collaboration, et al. 2023, Science, 380, 1338 Kerszberg, D., 2017, PhD Thesis, LPNHE LHAASO Collaboration, et al. 2021, Science, 373, 425 Liu, Y.-M., et al. 2024, Res. Astron. Astrophys., 24, 075016 Marinos, P. D., et al. 2023, MNRAS, 518, 4, 5036–5048 Marinos, P. D., et al. 2024, *in prep* Moskalenko, I. V., and Strong, A. W. 1998, ApJ, 493, 694 Recchia, S., et al. 2019, PhRvD, 99, 103022 Steppa, C., et al. 2020, A&A, 643, A137 Strong, A. W., Moskalenko, I. V. 1998, ApJ, 509, 212